**REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed December 20, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-15 were pending and rejected claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-15. Claims 1, 7, 9, 13 and 15 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, new claim 16 has been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-16 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

**REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Meyer, U.S. Patent No. 6,826,715 in view of Cleary, U.S. Patent No. 5,504,905. Meyer discusses a system for capturing computer configuration upon a program installation or request.

Claims 1, 7, 9 each have been amended. Claim 1 now recited "recording the acquired hardware configuration information into a predetermined nonvolatile storage medium with a hardware configuration information acquired previously, the previously acquired hardware configuration information containing a comparison field, the recording is performed by operation of the single computer program." Support for the amendment found in the Application at page 14 lines 21-26. The prior art failing to teach that the acquired hardware information is stored with previously acquired hardware configuration that contain a comparison field.

Further, Meyer at column 25 lines 18-22 states:

> For instance, **each time** the hardware or operating system **undergoes any configuration change**, the new configuration is captured and recorded as an ASCII text file. **Or, the system may run cpdiaga.exe at each startup**, recording configuration changes. [Emphasis added]

Thus, Meyer discusses capturing changes upon a configuration change or upon startup and recording that data. Thus Meyer discussing a recording step. Meyer therefore does not discuss "**acquiring** hardware configuration information of each device **at a plurality of predetermined timing sets**," as in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Meyer at column 2 lines 45-57 states:

> FIG. 1 shows a flow chart of the innovative process. First the program is installed and **run (cpqdiag.exe)** in a silent mode during installation to gather the base line computer hardware and operating system information in an ASCII text file called base.log. This file is stored in the \Windows\Cpqdiag\ directory (step 102). Later, the customer has a computer problem that requires customer service assistance (step 104). The customer then runs Compaq Diagnostics System Record tool

(**cpqdiaga.exe**) (step 106). [Emphasis added]

Thus, Meyer discusses the use of two programs (cpqdiag.exe and cpqdiaga.exe**)**. Cleary teaches a networked system distributed over multiple machines that implies more than one program. Therefore, Meyer does not teach or suggest "by operation of a single computer program," as in claim 1.

Cleary is a system for detecting configuration change during Initial Microcode Load (IML). While Cleary at column 10 lines 15-20 does discuss the storage of configuration changes during the POST, it does not discuss the use of "wherein the predetermined timing sets comprise timing at the time of executing BIOS." As discussed above in reference to Meyer, the recording of configuration data is not the "acquiring hardware configuration information of each device at a plurality of predetermined timing sets," as in claim 1.

Independent claims 7 and 9 are each unique from claim 1, but the features discusses above apply likewise to claims 7 and 9.

Therefore, Meyer and Cleary taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest the elements of claims 1, 7 and 9 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Meyer in view of Cleary in further view of Burgess, U.S. Patent No. 5,758,071.

Burgess at column 6 lines 10-15 discusses the storing of information as to a service or driver, not a hardware configuration. Therefore, Burgess does not teach or suggest "a process of acquiring hardware configuration information of each device," as in claim 6.

Therefore, Meyer, Cleary and Burgess taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest the elements of claim 6.

Claims 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Burgess in view of Cleary.

As to claims 13-15, Burgess lines 11-12 discusses monitoring the performance of a computer, not "acquired at a plurality of predetermined timing sets from the other computer through the network," as in claim 13 or "configuration information of each device acquired at a plurality of predetermined timing sets from the second computer through the network," as in claim 15. Further, as discussed above, Cleary does not teach or suggest "the predetermined timing sets comprises timing at the time of executing BIOS," as in claims 13 and 15.

As to claim 14, Burgess lines 35-38, discusses tracking program changes via a "configuration procedure 44." Burgess lines 38-55 discuss how it is determined if a configuration change has occurred, it does not discuss "updates the program" and therefore does not teach or suggest "an update section which updates the program related to the device of the other computer to the most up-to-date program when the comparison results in inconsistency," as in claim 14.

Further, claims 13 and 15 have been amended in manner consistent with the amendment to claims 1, 7 and 9. The prior art failing to teach or suggest "a process of recording said received hardware configuration information into a predetermined nonvolatile storage medium with a hardware configuration information acquired previously, the previously acquired hardware configuration information containing a comparison field," as in claim 15.

For at least the reasons stated above, Burgess and Cleary taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest the elements of claims 13-15.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

**NEW CLAIM**

Claim 16 is new. Support for the amendment found in the Application at page 14 lines 21-26 and claim 1. The prior art failing to teach that the currently acquired hardware information is stored with previously acquired hardware configuration that contain a comparison field.

**SUMMARY**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 20, 2007

By: /James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501